DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 283 SP 032 600

AUTHOR Stolworthy, Reed L.
TITLE Teaching Competencies in Preservice Teacher Education: A Study of the Analysis of Variance in the Evaluative Efforts.
PUB DATE 11 Jun 90
NOTE 69p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Analysis of Variance; *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Interrater Reliability; Preservice Teacher Education; Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Student Teacher Evaluation; *Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine the degree of variance found existing among three different groups of evaluators relative to their assessments of the teaching competencies demonstrated by 60 preservice teacher education students. Data were obtained relative to the undergraduates' self-evaluations regarding the ability to demonstrate 25 teaching competencies. Data were also obtained from the evaluations of those students' cooperating teacher(s) and university supervisor(s) regarding the same 25 teaching competencies. The rating scale contained the same criteria related to the teaching-learning process. Descriptive and inferential statistics were applied to the data to determine significant differences in the assessments made by the three groups. In most instances, the mean values were not significantly different for the three groups of evaluators. The greatest differences were found between the evaluations derived from the student teachers and those obtained from cooperating teachers and university supervisors on maintaining a professional appearance. Another significant difference between the student teachers' evaluations and those of the cooperating teachers had to do with using appropriate resources for the development of lessons. Data from the study are displayed on appended tables, and the evaluation instruments are included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TEACHING COMPETENCIES IN PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION: A STUDY OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN THE EVALUATIVE EFFORTS

ED324283

SUBMITTED BY

DR. REED L. STOLWORTHY
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Stolworthy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 032 600

JUNE 11, 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. 3

Problem Statement 3

Research Design 4

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Analysis of Variance . . 5

The Level of Significance 6

Conclusion. 8

Appendix A. 9

Tables 1-25

The Mean and Standard Deviation

Appendix B. 35

Tables 26-50

The Analysis of Variance

Multiple Comparisons: Scheffe's LSD

A Matrix of Probabilities

Appendix C. 61

Table 51

Summary Table Listing Levels of Significance

Appendix D. 65

The Evaluative Instruments

TEACHING COMPETENCIES IN PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION: A STUDY OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN THE EVALUATIVE EFFORTS

This study of preservice student teachers involved a population of 24 (n = 24) undergraduates certified to teach by Washburn University's teacher preparation program during Fall Semester of 1988 and 36 (n = 36) undergraduates during the Spring semester of 1989 for a total of 60 (N = 60) undergraduates. Data were obtained relative to the undergraduates' self evaluation regarding the ability to demonstrate twenty-five teaching competencies. In addition, the student teaching evaluations completed during the Fall of 1988 and the Spring of 1989 by the above undergraduates' cooperating teacher(s) (n = 34, Fall 1988 and n = 45, Spring 1989) and university supervisor(s) (n = 26, Fall 1988 and n = 30, Spring 1989) were also included regarding the evaluation of the very same teaching-learning competencies.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree of variance found existing among three different groups of evaluators relative to their assessments of the teaching competencies demonstrated by preservice teacher education students. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What is the Mean and Standard Deviation relative to the student teachers' self-evaluation concerning the competencies related to the teaching-learning process?

2. What is the Mean and Standard Deviation regarding the performance of the student teachers when measured with the same rating scale administered by their respective cooperating teacher(s) and university supervisor(s)?
3. Does the application of Scheffe's LSD Matrix of Multiple Comparisons show any significant differences in the evaluative efforts of the student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors?

Research Design

Each evaluative instrument utilized in the study was based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. The respondents were to check the column labeled NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency, and in the case of the undergraduate, NA would be checked if the respondent did not have an opportunity to demonstrate a particular competency (Appendix D).

At the end of student teaching, the student teacher, cooperating teacher,and university supervisor completed the rating scale containing the same criteria related to the teaching-learning process. The data were obtained from the above and tabulated and analyzed on the computer. The quantitative results were expressed through descriptive and inferential statistics.

It can readily be noticed that the left hand column of tables 1 through 25 (Appendix A) lists the numbers on the

rating scale with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. In addition, the respondents were to check NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency, and in the case of the undergraduate, NA would be check if the respondent did not have an opportunity to demonstrate a particular competency. The numbers listed across the tables indicate the number of responses received at each of the points on the rating scale by each of the respective groups. The mean values and standard deviations relative to each of the competencies are listed at the bottom of each table.

The Mean, Standard Deviation, and Analysis of Variance

Tables 1 through 25 (Appendix A) show the mean scores and standard deviations for the twenty-five competencies related to teaching as represented by the Fall, 1988 and Spring, 1989 student teachers. Mean scores were obtained in regards to the student teacher's perception of his/her competencies related to the teaching-learning process. Tables 26-50 (Appendix B) illustrate the multiple comparisons of the above three groups of evaluators as provided through the application of the analysis of variance by using Scheffe's levels of significant differences (LSD). A matrix of probabilities was obtained for each competency through the multiple comparisons provided in Scheffe's LSD relative to the above groups of evaluators assessing the

competence of the Fall 1988 and Spring 1989 student teachers.

The Level of Significance

Since a (p) value between 0.05 is usually thought of as marginally significant, anything greater was labeled in this study as a nonsignificant difference. Tables 26 through 50 (Appendix B) show the matrix of probabilities illustrated through the application of Scheffe's multiple comparisons for each of the mean scores of Fall semester 1988 and Spring Semester 1989 to the mean scores derived from the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. The variability which occurred within this study was depicted through taking into account the size and location of each individual score in terms of each respective mean score derived from the three groups of respondents. Table 51 (Appendix C) lists the differences found among and within the various mean scores. Fifty comparison were made by selecting the two most significant values derived on each of the twenty five competencies. It can readily be noticed that the assessments of the specific competencies in the student teachers by the three groups of evaluators were significantly different in only three instances. Thus, no significant differences were derived from the three different groups of evaluators in forty-seven of the fifty comparisons. The three instances of significant differences

were at or below the .05 level. These particular differences occurred while rating the student teacher on two of the twenty five competencies. Thus, there were no significant differences noted among all the evaluators when the student teachers were rated on the other twenty-three competencies.

Conclusion

The mean values derived from the application of the rating scale by the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors relative to the student teachers' ability to demonstrate competencies related to the teaching-learning process were in most instances not significantly different for the three groups of evaluators. Only three instances were found where significant differences existed below the .05 level of significance.

The greatest differences were found to exist between the evaluations derived from the student teachers and the evaluations obtained from the cooperating teachers (e.g. p =.02). This particular level dealt with maintaining a professional appearance. The level (e.g. p = .03) was derived between the university supervisors and the student teachers regarding this same competency of maintaining a professional appearance. Other instances at the .03 level of significance dealt with differences between the student teachers and the cooperating teachers relative to using appropriate resources for the development of lessons.

The above significant differences occurred while rating the student teacher on two of the twenty-five competencies. Thus, there were no significant differences noted among all the evaluators when the student teachers were evaluated on the other twenty-three competencies.

APPENDIX A
TABLES 1-25
THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION

TABLE 1

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 1-PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	0	1	0	1	0	0
4	9	8	3	9	1	6
5	14	27	30	34	20	24
Competent						
NA	1	0	1	0	5	0
Mean	4.61	4.72	4.91	4.69	4.95	4.80
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.51	0.29	0.63	0.22	0.41

TABLE 2

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 2-MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	2	1	1	4	0	2
4	4	10	9	11	8	8
5	17	25	24	30	18	20
Competent						
NA	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.65	4.67	4.68	4.58	4.69	4.60
Standard Deviation	0.65	0.53	0.53	0.66	0.47	0.62

TABLE 3

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 3-CONFIDENCE IN ABILITY TO TEACH

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 88	Sp.89	Fall 88	Sp.89	Fall 88	Sp. 89
	N=24	N=36	N=34	N=45	N=26	N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	3	4	1	4	1	3
4	7	11	8	14	9	11
5	14	21	25	26	16	16
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.46	4.47	4.71	4.44	4.58	4.43
Standard						
Deviation	0.72	0.70	0.52	0.76	0.58	0.68

TABLE 4

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 4-MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	0	0	1
3	0	0	0	3	1	0
4	3	1	8	9	5	5
5	21	35	25	33	20	24
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.88	4.97	4.68	4.67	4.73	4.73
Standard Deviation	0.34	0.17	0.64	0.60	0.53	0.64

TABLE 5

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 5-COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN CLASSROOM

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	1	0
3	3	3	2	5	2	3
4	10	14	11	13	7	13
5	11	19	21	27	15	14
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.33	4.44	4.56	4.49	4.44	4.37
Standard Deviation	0.70	0.65	0.61	0.69	0.82	0.67

TABLE 6

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 6-PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	1	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	1	0	0	1	0
3	5	3	0	0	1	2
4	6	6	2	3	3	3
5	6	17	15	23	12	10
Competent						
NA	5	9	17	19	9	15
Mean	3.79	4.44	4.88	4.88	4.53	4.53
Standard Deviation	1.13	0.85	0.33	0.33	0.87	0.74

TABLE 7

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 7-REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	4	1	0
4	5	5	7	7	5	3
5	17	31	17	34	20	27
Competent						
NA	2	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.77	4.86	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.90
Standard Deviation	0.43	0.35	0.41	0.64	0.53	0.31

TABLE 8

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 8-PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp.89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	1	1	0	3	0	1
4	4	5	12	3	2	3
5	19	30	22	38	22	25
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	2	1
Mean	4.83	4.81	4.65	4.73	4.92	4.83
Standard Deviation	0.39	0.47	0.49	0.69	0.28	0.47

TABLE 9

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 9-PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	0	0	0
3	2	3	2	1	0	2
4	6	11	2	7	1	4
5	14	21	26	34	24	24
Competent						
NA	2	0	4	3	1	0
Mean	4.55	4.44	4.80	4.79	4.96	4.73
Standard Deviation	0.67	0.77	0.55	0.47	0.20	0.58

TABLE 10

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 10-USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	4	0	0	0	2
4	7	9	6	10	8	5
5	16	23	26	35	18	23
Competent						
NA	0	0	2	0	0	0
Mean	4.63	4.53	4.81	4.78	4.69	4.70
Standard Deviation	0.58	0.70	0.40	0.42	0.47	0.60

TABLE 11

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 11-DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERESTS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	1	0	1
3	4	2	1	2	2	2
4	8	12	7	15	6	8
5	12	21	24	27	16	19
Competent						
NA	0	0	2	0	2	0
Mean	4.33	4.47	4.72	4.51	4.58	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.76	0.74	0.52	0.69	0.65	0.78

TABLE 12

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 12-DEVELOPS LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	0	0	1	1	0
3	1	4	1	2	0	0
4	6	13	7	15	8	11
5	16	18	23	26	17	19
Competent						
NA	0	1	3	1	0	0
Mean	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.50	4.58	4.63
Standard Deviation	0.78	0.69	0.53	0.70	0.70	0.49

TABLE 13

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 13-OBTAIN APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	1	0	0	0	0
3	2	1	0	1	2	0
4	2	16	5	10	7	9
5	9	18	27	34	16	21
Competent						
NA	0	0	2	0	1	0
Mean	4.63	4.42	4.84	4.73	4.56	4.70
Standard Deviation	0.82	0.69	0.37	0.50	0.65	0.47

TABLE 14

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 14-CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	0	1	1	0
3	4	5	0	4	1	2
4	8	11	10	13	11	11
5	12	19	22	27	13	17
Competent						
NA	0	0	2	0	0	0
Mean	4.33	4.33	4.69	4.47	4.38	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.76	0.83	0.47	0.76	0.75	0.63

TABLE 15

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 15-PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

Incom-petent	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	0	1	0	0	0	1
3	3	3	0	5	1	1
4	12	13	9	12	11	13
5	9	19	24	28	14	15
Competent						
NA	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean	4.25	4.39	4.73	4.51	4.50	4.40
Standard Deviation	0.68	0.77	0.45	0.69	0.58	0.72

TABLE 16

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 16-MANAGES CLASSROOM FACILITIES EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	1
3	4	2	1	4	1	3
4	10	12	10	12	5	10
5	10	22	23	29	20	15
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mean	4.25	4.56	4.65	4.56	4.73	4.34
Standard Deviation	0.74	0.61	0.54	0.66	0.53	0.81

TABLE 17

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 17-MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	2	0	2	1	2
3	3	3	2	7	2	6
4	9	16	9	13	6	8
5	10	15	23	23	17	14
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.13	4.22	4.62	4.27	4.50	4.13
Standard Deviation	0.95	0.83	0.60	0.89	0.81	0.97

TABLE 18

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 18-DEVELOP APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	0	0	0	0	1
3	0	4	0	3	1	3
4	9	19	8	18	7	8
5	11	12	22	23	16	16
Competent						
NA	2	1	4	1	2	2
Mean	4.32	4.23	4.73	4.45	4.63	4.39
Standard Deviation	0.89	0.65	0.45	0.63	0.58	0.83

TABLE 19

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 19-ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	1
3	3	4	1	3	0	2
4	6	12	4	17	9	11
5	14	19	24	25	16	16
Competent						
NA	1	1	5	0	1	0
Mean	4.48	4.43	4.79	4.49	4.64	4.40
Standard Deviation	0.73	0.70	0.49	0.63	0.49	0.77

TABLE 20

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 20-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	3	0	2
4	5	5	6	6	3	5
5	17	17	26	25	16	16
Competent						
NA	2	14	2	11	7	7
Mean	4.77	4.77	4.81	4.65	4.84	4.61
Standard Deviation	0.43	0.43	0.40	0.65	0.37	0.66

TABLE 21

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 21-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

Incom-	Student		Cooperating		University	
petent	Teaches		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Fall 88	Sp.89	Fall 88	Sp.89	Fall 88	Sp. 89
	N=24	N=36	N=34	N=45	N=26	N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	2	1	0	2	0	4
4	6	9	7	10	5	5
5	13	19	25	25	17	16
Competent						
NA	3	7	2	7	4	5
Mean	4.52	4.62	4.78	4.55	4.77	4.48
Standard Deviation	0.68	0.56	0.42	0.72	0.43	0.77

TABLE 22

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 22-DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	1	0	0	4	2	6
4	7	7	9	10	5	4
5	16	28	24	30	19	20
Competent						
NA	0	1	1	0	0	0
Mean	4.63	4.80	4.73	4.53	4.65	4.47
Standard Deviation	0.58	0.41	0.45	0.76	0.63	0.82

TABLE 23

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 23-COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	4	4	2	5	1	3
4	9	10	4	10	5	9
5	10	20	25	26	16	18
Competent						
NA	1	2	3	4	4	0
Mean	4.26	4.47	4.74	4.51	4.68	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.75	0.71	0.58	0.71	0.57	0.68

TABLE 24

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 24-COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1	0	1
3	0	0	1	1	1	1
4	5	8	1	5	4	3
5	19	28	31	37	19	25
Competent						
NA	0	0	1	1	2	0
Mean	4.79	4.78	4.91	4.77	4.75	4.73
Standard Deviation	0.41	0.42	0.38	0.60	0.53	0.69

TABLE 25

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 25-MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL, OPEN MINDEDNESS, FLEXIBILITY

Incom-	Student Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Fall 88 N=24	Sp.89 N=36	Fall 88 N=34	Sp.89 N=45	Fall 88 N=26	Sp. 89 N=30
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	0	0	3	0	1
4	5	9	3	7	3	4
5	18	27	31	35	23	25
Competent						
NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.71	4.75	4.91	4.71	4.88	4.80
Standard Deviation	0.55	0.44	0.29	0.59	0.33	0.48

APPENDIX B
TABLES 26-50
THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

TABLE 26

PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.581	*.338
Cooperating Teachers	**.581	1.000	.826
University Supervisors	*.338	.862	1.000

*p< .338 or .34 level of significance

**p< .581 or .58 level of significance

TABLE 27

MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.869	**.966
Cooperating Teachers	*.869	1.000	*.966
University Supervisors	**.966	**.966	1.000

*p< .869 or .87 level of significance

**p< .966 or .97 level of significance

TABLE 28

CONFIDENCE IN THE ABILITY TO TEACH

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.714	.953
Cooperating Teachers	*.714	1.000	.863
University Supervisors	.953	.863	1.000

*p< .714 or .71 level of significance

**p< .863 or .86 level of significance

TABLE 29

MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.015	**.030
Cooperating Teachers	*.015	1.000	.437
University Supervisors	**.030	.437	1.000

*p< .015 or .02 level of significance

**p< .030 or .03 level of significance

TABLE 30

COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN THE CLASSROOM

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.215	.948
Cooperating Teachers	*.215	1.000	**.284
University Supervisors	.948	**.284	1.000

*p< .215 or .22 level of significance

**p< .284 or.28 level of significance

TABLE 31

PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.137	**.410
Cooperating Teachers	*.137	1.000	.505
University Supervisors	**.410	.505	1.000

*p< .137 or .14 level of significance

**p< .410 or.41 level of significance

TABLE 32

REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	**1.000	*.691	**1.00
Cooperating Teachers	*.991	**1.000	*.691
University Supervisors	**1.00	*.691	**1.000

*p< .691 or .69 level of significance

**p<1.000 or 1.00 level of significance

TABLE 33

PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.170	.601
Cooperating Teachers	**.170	1.000	.076
University Supervisors	.601	.076	1.000

*p< .076 or .08 level of significance

**p< .170 or.17 level of significance

TABLE 34

PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.137	*.096
Cooperating Teachers	**.137	1.000	.894
University Supervisors	*.096	.894	1.000

*p< .096 or .10 level of significance

**p< .137 or.14 level of significance

TABLE 35

USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.034	**.160
Cooperating Teachers	~*.034	1.000	.211
University Supervisors	**.160	.211	1.000

*p< .034 or .03 level of significance

**p< .160 or.16 level of significance

TABLE 36

DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERESTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.283	**.515
Cooperating Teachers	*.283	1.000	.800
University Supervisors	**.515	.800	1.000

*p< .283 or .28 level of significance

**p< .515 or.52 level of significance

TABLE 37

DEVELOPS LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	**1.000	*.519	*.519
Cooperating Teachers	*.519	1.000	**1.000
University Supervisors	*.519	**1.000	**1.000

*p< .519 or .52 level of significance

**p< 1.000 or 1.00 level of significance

TABLE 38

OBTAINS APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.215	.683
Cooperating Teachers	*.215	1.000	**.480
University Supervisors	.683	**.480	1.000

*p< .215 or .22 level of significance

**p< .480 or.48 level of significance

TABLE 39

CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.194	.615
Cooperating Teachers	*.194	1.000	**.484
University Supervisors	.615	**.484	1.000

*p< .194 or .19 level of significance

**p< .484 or.48 level of significance

TABLE 40

PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.164	.584
Cooperating Teachers	*.167	1.000	**.436
University Supervisors	.584	**.436	1.000

*p< .167 or .17 level of significance

**p< .436 or.44 level of significance

TABLE 41

MANAGES CLASSROOMS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.667	**.830
Cooperating Teachers	*.667	1.000	.946
University Supervisors	**.830	.946	1.000

*p< .667 or .67 level of significance

**p< .830 or.83 level of significance

TABLE 42

MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.522	**.814
Cooperating Teachers	*.522	1.000	.836
University Supervisors	**.814	.836	1.000

*p< .522 or .52 level of significance

**p< .814 or.81 level of significance

TABLE 43

DEVELOPS APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.273	**.427
Cooperating Teachers	*.273	1.000	.879
University Supervisors	**.427	.879	1.000

*p< .273 or .27 level of significance

**p< .427 or.43 level of significance

TABLE 44

ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	.570	.921
Cooperating Teachers	*.570	1.000	**.769
University Supervisors	.921	**.769	1.000

*p< .570 or .57 level of significance

**p< .769 or.77 level of significance

TABLE 45

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.942	*.927
Cooperating Teachers	**.942	1.000	1.000
University Supervisors	*.927	1.000	1.000

*p< .927 or .93 level of significance

**p< .942 or.94 level of significance

TABLE 46

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.840	**.942
Cooperating Teachers	*.840	1.000	.970
University Supervisors	**.942	.970	1.000

*p< .840 or .84 level of significance

**p< .942 or.94 level of significance

TABLE 47

DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.818	*.560
Cooperating Teachers	**.818	1.000	.870
University Supervisors	*.560	.870	1.000

*p< .560 or .56 level of significance

**p< .818 or.82 level of significance

TABLE 48

COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*.342	**.421
Cooperating Teachers	*.342	1.000	.970
University Supervisors	**.421	.974	1.000

*p< .342 or .34 level of significance

**p< .421 or.42 level of significance

TABLE 49

COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	*8.675	.760
Cooperating Teachers	**.675	1.000	*.355
University Supervisors	.760	*.355	1.000

*p< .355 or .36 level of significance

**p< .675 or.68 level of significance

TABLE 50

MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL OPEN-MINDEDNESS, AND FLEXIBILITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: SCHEFFE'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Student Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Student Teachers	1.000	**.703	*.543
Cooperating Teachers	**.703	1.000	.947
University Supervisors	*.543	.947	1.000

*p< .543 or .54 level of significance

**p< .703 or .70 level of significance

APPENDIX C
TABLE 51
SUMMARY TABLE LISTING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

TABLE 51

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance	Evaluators Showing Greatest Variance Between Each Other
Practices Professional Ethics	.34	University Super. - Student Teacher
Practices Professional Ethics	.58	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Maintains Enthusiasm	.87	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Maintains Enthusiasm	.97	University Super. - Student Teacher
Confidence in Ability	.71	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Confidence in Ability	.86	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Professional Appearance	.02	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Professional Appearance	.03	University Super. - Student Teacher
Communicates Effectively	.22	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Communicates Effectively	.28	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Professional Organizations	.14	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Professional Organizations	.41	University Super. - Student Teacher
Profits from Suggestions	.69	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Profits from Suggestions	.69	University Super. - Student Teacher
Practices Punctuality	.08	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Practices Punctuality	.17	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
School Activities	.10	University Super. - Student Teacher
School Activities	.14	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Resources for Development	.03	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Resources for Development	.16	University Super. - Student Teacher
Determines Student Needs	.28	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Determines Student Needs	.52	University Super. - Student Teacher

TABLE 51 CONTINUED

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance	Evaluators Showing Greatest Variance Between Each Other
Develops Lesson Plans	.52	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Develops Lesson Plans	.52	University Super. - Student Teacher
Resources for Teaching	.22	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Resources for Teaching	.48	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Strategies for Teaching	.19	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Strategies for Teaching	.48	Cooperating Teacher - University Super.
Presents Lesson Effectively	.17	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Presents Lesson Effectively	.44	Cooperating Teacher - University Super.
Manages Classroom Facilities	.67	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Manages Classroom Facilities	.83	University Super. - Student Teacher
Manages Classroom Behavior	.52	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Manages Classroom Behavior	.81	University Super. - Student Teacher
Develops Evaluation Devices	.27	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Develops Evaluation Devices	.43	University Super. - Student Teacher
Assesses Student Progress	.57	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Assesses Student Progress	.77	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Works with Various Cultures	.93	University Super. -Student Teacher
Works with Various Cultures	.94	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Work with Exceptional Students	.84	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Work with Exceptional Students	.94	University Super. - Student Teacher
Develops Rapport	.56	University Super. - Student Teacher

TABLE 51 CONTINUED

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF FALL 1988 AND SPRING 1989 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance	Evaluators Showing Greatest Variance Between Each Other
Develops Rapport	.82	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Counsels Students Effectively	.34	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Counsels Students Effectively	.42	University Super. - Student Teacher
Cooperates with School	.36	University Super. - Cooperating Teacher
Cooperates with School	.68	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher
Personal Behavior	.54	University Super. - Student Teacher
Personal Behavior	.70	Cooperating Teacher - Student Teacher

APPENDIX D
THE EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENTS

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: In order to evaluate your performance during student teaching, please rate your competence on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not perform a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. Confidence in ability to teach	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. Maintain professional appearance	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. Communicate effectively in classroom	___	___	___	___	___	___
6. Participate in professional organization	___	___	___	___	___	___
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions	___	___	___	___	___	___
8. Practice punctuality	___	___	___	___	___	___
9. Participate in school activities	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons	___	___	___	___	___	___
11. Determine student needs and interests	___	___	___	___	___	___
12. Develop long-range and daily plans	___	___	___	___	___	___
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
15. Present lessons effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices	___	___	___	___	___	___
19. Assess and interpret student progress	___	___	___	___	___	___
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures	___	___	___	___	___	___
21. Work effectively with exceptional students	___	___	___	___	___	___
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students	___	___	___	___	___	___
23. Counsel students appropriately	___	___	___	___	___	___
24. Cooperate with all school personnel	___	___	___	___	___	___
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___

Comments:

_____
Student's Signature

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics						
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching						
3. Confidence in ability to teach						
4. Maintain professional appearance						
5. Communicate effectively in classroom						
6. Participate in professional organization						
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions						
8. Practice punctuality						
9. Participate in school activities						
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons						
11. Determine student needs and interests						
12. Develop long-range and daily plans						
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching						
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching						
15. Present lessons effectively						
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively						
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively						
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices						
19. Assess and interpret student progress						
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures						
21. Work effectively with exceptional students						
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students						
23. Counsel students appropriately						
24. Cooperate with all school personnel						
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.						

Comments:

_____
Cooperating Teacher

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. Confidence in ability to teach	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. Maintain professional appearance	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. Communicate effectively in classroom	___	___	___	___	___	___
6. Participate in professional organization	___	___	___	___	___	___
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions	___	___	___	___	___	___
8. Practice punctuality	___	___	___	___	___	___
9. Participate in school activities	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons	___	___	___	___	___	___
11. Determine student needs and interests	___	___	___	___	___	___
12. Develop long-range and daily plans	___	___	___	___	___	___
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
15. Present lessons effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices	___	___	___	___	___	___
19. Assess and interpret student progress	___	___	___	___	___	___
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures	___	___	___	___	___	___
21. Work effectively with exceptional students	___	___	___	___	___	___
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students	___	___	___	___	___	___
23. Counsel students appropriately	___	___	___	___	___	___
24. Cooperate with all school personnel	___	___	___	___	___	___
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___

Comments:

_____
University Supervisor